



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,489	02/27/2002	Masaki Tonomura	1095.1213	5927
21171	7590	04/10/2007	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			ROMANO, JOHN J	
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			2192	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	04/10/2007		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/083,489	TONOMURA, MASAKI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	John J. Romano	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on January 4th, 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12, 15 + 16 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12, 15 + 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1-4-07</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

Remarks

1. Applicant's amendment and response received January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2007, responding to the September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2006, Office action provided in the rejections of claims 1-12, 15 and 16, wherein independent claims 1, 9, 11 and 15, have been amended, claims 1-12, 15 and 16, remain pending in the application and which have been fully considered by the examiner.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims rejection have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. See Adams et al., US 2002/0111936 (new art of record & hereinafter **Adams**).

Thus, the rejection of the claims over prior art in the previous Office action is maintained in light of additional new grounds of rejection as *necessitated by amendment* and **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2192

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### **Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-12 and 15-16, are pending in this action.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 9-12 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al., US 6,587,969 B1 (hereinafter **Weinberg**) in view of Renner et al., US 6,993,657 (hereinafter **Renner**) and further in view of Adams et al., US 2002/0111936 (new art of record & hereinafter **Adams**).

In regard to claims 1, 9 and 11 **Weinberg** discloses:

- "...computer readable medium storing...", (E.g., see Column 6, lines 1-15), wherein data is stored and read.
- "... for assisting in testing operation of a server computer which provides services using a structured document which can be browsed

- by a document browsing device, the test assisting program enabling a computer to carry out a process comprising steps of...”, (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 2, lines 23-35), wherein the testing tool comprises a test assisting program and the structured documents are the programs for the web pages displayed by the web browser.*
- “...acquiring ....formal requirements for data to be inputted to a data input area of the structured document upon reception of the structured document from the server computer ...”, (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 22, lines 60-64), wherein the data to be entered would comprise an input step that requires data from a parameter.*
- “... generating candidate data for ...the data input area based on the formal requirements therefor ...”, (E.g., see Figure 8 & Column 21, line 46 – Column 22, line 7), wherein the data references associated with the function call, associated with data tables in the input/output data library, are generated and (Column 2, lines 53-56), wherein “An important benefit of this feature is that it allows the user to generate and edit tests...”.*
- “... inserting the candidate data ...for enabling the document browsing device to carry out a process of displaying the candidate data and a process of entering the candidate data selected by an operation input into the data input area, in the structured document...”, (E.g., see Figure 3B & Column 19, lines 32-52), wherein the loop object provides*

instructions for input data to the browser to display a structured document or view of a webpage.

- “*... transferring the structured document with the candidate data inserted therein to the document browsing device .*”, (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 22, lines 22-36), wherein the testing tool is the processing description to test a structured document and is shown in Figure 6C being communicated to a server, thus transferred.

But **Weinberg** does not expressly disclose “*...being defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof, the input area being defined in the structured document by using a second tag and parameters thereof, the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...*” or “*... into the structured document by using a third tag...*”. However, **Renner** discloses:

- “*... the formal requirements being defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof...*”, (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 21, lines 35-46), wherein the data (name) to be entered would comprise attribute value of the component used and that data provided (name) relates to the second tag describing the individual component. The first tag is the template used to hold the input name required (E.g., see Table 1B, line 9) and the second tag defines the input area (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, lines 21-24)
- “*...the input area being defined in the structured document by using a second tag and parameters thereof, the first and second tags sharing a*

*common parameter value...”, (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 21, lines 35-46), wherein the data (name) to be entered would comprise attribute value of the component used and that data provided (name) relates to the second tag describing the individual component . The first tag is the template used to hold the input name required (E.g., see Column 27, Table 1B, line 9) and the second tag defines the input area (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, lines 21-24.*

- *“...the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...”, (E.g., see Column 27, Table 1B, lines 1-13), wherein a default common value is given until a developer optionally adjusts the value at a later time.*
- *“... into the structured document by using a third tag...”, (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, line 5), wherein a third tag in the structured document involves a processing description.*

**Weinberg** and **Renner** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, managing a web server. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine first, second and third tags in a structured document with **Weinbergs'** testing method and display. The motivation is disclosed by **Weinberg**, “The expert mode allows the user to...make modifications to the text. The user can thereby create functions and queries that may not be part of the automated features of the test to provide a higher level of test customization”, (Column 20, lines 7-11). Additionally, the

"custom" tags disclosed by **Renner** above (E.g., see Table 2) would have further.

motivated a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify by creating custom tags as shown.

But **Weinberg** and **Renner** do not expressly disclose "...*maximum length of text...*" or "... *wherein the candidate data is a piece of text with a length greater than the maximum length acquired from the first tag, and wherein the piece of text describes in itself the fact that the length of the text is greater than the maximum length...*" or "whereby a test operator operating the document browsing device can select and enter the candidate data to the data input area on the structured document with an intent to see how the server computer reacts to violation of the formal requirement for the data input area". However, **Adams** discloses:

- "...maximum length of text..." (E.g., see Figure 4 & paragraph [0048]), wherein the minimum/maximum length of text is disclosed.
- "whereby a test operator operating the document browsing device can select and enter the candidate data to the data input area on the structured document with an intent to see how the server computer reacts to violation of the formal requirement for the data input area" (E.g., see Figure 6 & paragraph [0063]), wherein the invention allows for the generation of data that can purposely fail, and through this failure, invoke additional error handling programming.

However, the combined art of **Weinberg**, **Renner** and **Adams** does not expressly disclose "... wherein the candidate data is a piece of text with a length greater

then the maximum length acquired from the first tag, and wherein the piece of text describes in itself the fact that the length of the text is greater than the maximum length.... However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to test the boundaries of the minimum/maximum length of the data input in light of Adams disclosure of user editing the structural characteristics including maximum length of the data (See Figure 4 & paragraph [0047] – [0055]) for the benefits of purposely failing to invoke error handling as explicitly disclosed by the invention.

Furthermore, **Adams** expressly discloses boundary testing for maximum values (See Figure 2 & paragraph [0071]), referred to as *maximum plus*, wherein *maximum plus* uses the *structural characteristics* to determine the maximum value in order to output one data set for each filed (24) that meets the maximum plus value, as well as one data set for each field that exceed that maximum plus value with the presumption of success of failure indicated (italics for emphasis added).

With respect to “describing in itself the fact that the length of the text is greater than the maximum length” **Adams** discloses “structured data refers to XML, EDI or other “tagged” data formats” (See paragraph [0028]). Adams also expressly discloses that “the analysis of electronic data files requires descriptive information, whether found within the data file or sourced externally, to identify and describe each data element.” (see paragraph [0003] – [0004]) wherein data benefits from descriptive information describing length. Additionally, **Adams** discloses a detailed table to list the structural characteristics that may be reviewed and/or edited by the user, including but not limited to minimum/maximum length (See paragraph [0047] – [0048]). Therefore, one of

ordinary skill in the art, would have been motivated to describe the "maximum plus" data in the structured document used to purposely fail/test the system (computer/server computer) as disclosed by **Adams**.

In regard to claim 2, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Weinberg** discloses:

- "... generating data matching the formal requirements and data not matching the formal requirements.", (E.g., see Figure 4A & Column 15, lines 15-34), wherein the result is "TRUE" if the data matches or "NOT TRUE" if it does not.

In regard to claims 3, 10 and 12 **Weinberg** discloses:

- "... determining details of an operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out a process when the operation input is applied to the document browsing device...", (E.g., see Table 2 & Column 9 – Column 10), wherein the "Submit Data" step comprises input data submitted to the server and "Text check", "Image Check" and "Applet Check" perform processes with the applied input.
- "... generating a log file in which the determined details of the operation input are recorded...", (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 23, lines 11-19), wherein a log file is generated from the test results.
- "... reproducing the operation input applied to the document browsing device according to the details of the operation input which are recorded in the log file.", (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 24, lines 45-

51), wherein the spreadsheet location may be the test results recorded in the log file.

In regard to claim 4, the rejections of base claim 3 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Weinberg** discloses:

- “*...an object to be operated on is displayed in highlight for a predetermined period of time when the operation input is reproduced.*”, (E.g., see Column 16, lines 44-46), wherein when the test is played back or reproduced and the corresponding objects or steps are highlighted. The predetermined time period is the duration of the execution of that particular step.

In regard to claims 9 and 10, they are system versions of the process of claims 1 and 3 respectively. Therefore, the limitations of claims 9 and 10 are met accordingly.

In regard to claims 11 and 12, they are apparatus versions of the process of claims 1 and 3 respectively. Therefore, the limitations of claims 11 and 12 are met accordingly.

In regard to claim 15, **Weinberg** discloses:

- “*A method for testing operation of a server computer from a browsing computer, comprising: acquiring formal requirements for data to be inputted to a data input area upon reception of a document from the server computer ...*”, (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 21, lines 35-46), wherein the data to be entered would comprise attribute type or information for the input to the structured document from the server.

- "... generating candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area based on the formal requirements.", (E.g., see Figure 8 & Column 21, line 46 – Column 22, line 7), wherein the data references associated with the function call, associated with data tables in the input/output data library, are generated and (Column 2, lines 53-56), wherein "An important benefit of this feature is that it allows the user to generate and edit tests...".

See claim 1 for the remaining limitations.

In regard to claim 16, Weinberg does not expressly disclose "*...wherein the inserting operation inserts the third tag and parameters thereof after the second tag defining the data input area, such that the candidate data will be associated with the data input area.*" However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to insert the *third tag and parameters thereof* after the second tag defining the data input are, such that the candidate data will be associated with the data input area. It is old and well known in the art to further define information in a structured document with subsequent tags. Further motivation would have been that it is old and well known in the art that structured documents are a hierarchical data structure that has a sequence of tags defining data.

3. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of Renner and further in view of Adams.

In regard to claim 5, the rejections of base claim 4 are incorporated. But **Weinberg, Renner and Adams** do not expressly disclose "...the operation input is prevented from being reproduced until the display in highlight of the object to be operated on is finished.". However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to prevent the next operation or input operation from being performed until the previous step or decision was completed or confirmed. The motivation to do so would have been to complete an iteration of the test before entering another input to begin another iteration. This would be consistent with certain testing phases of a web browser as it is often beneficial to test one thing at a time. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to prevent an input operation form being reproduced until the highlighted display of a step or object is finished.

In regard to claim 6, the rejections of base claim 3 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Weinberg** discloses:

- "*...wherein when a process result is returned from the server computer due to the reproduced operation input, the test assisting program enables the computer to compare the process result and a past process result returned from the server computer due to the operation input...*", (E.g., see Figures 5C-E & Column 19, lines 12-31), wherein the output of the test and verify expression or comparison definition are returned due to the input.

But **Weinberg** does not expressly disclose "...and display a difference between the compared process results.". However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to customize the comparison by displaying the difference if appropriate. The motivation is disclosed by **Weinberg**, "The expert mode allows the user to...make modifications to the text. The user can thereby create functions and queries that may not be part of the automated features of the test to provide a higher level of test customization.", (Column 20, lines 7-11). Thus, if a display of the difference would be beneficial the suggestion to customize the function was evident. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to customize the display to incorporate the difference of the compared results.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Weinberg** in view of **Renner** and further in view of **Adams** in view of **Dantressangle**, US 6,446,120 B1 (hereinafter **Dantressangle**).

In regard to claim 7, the rejections of base claim 3 are incorporated. But **Weinberg** does not expressly disclose "...to measure a time from a decision in the operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out the process until a process result is returned from the server computer, and display the measured time.". However, **Dantressangle** discloses:

- "...to measure a time from a decision in the operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out the process until a process

*result is returned from the server computer, and display the measured time.*", (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 8, lines 41-60), wherein a timer function is used to provide a report or display the measured time.

**Weinberg, Renner, Adams** and **Dantressangle** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, testing a web server. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine a measured time with **Weinbergs'** testing method and display. The motivation is disclosed by **Weinberg**, "The expert mode allows the user to...make modifications to the text. The user can thereby create functions and queries that may not be part of the automated features of the test to provide a higher level of test customization.", (Column 20, lines 7-11).

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Weinberg** in view of **Renner** and further in view **Adams** in view of Gough et al., US 6,072,489, (hereinafter **Gough**).

In regard to claim 8, the rejections of base claim 3 are incorporated. But **Weinberg** does not expressly disclose "...to render translucent an operation view for entering the operation input and display the translucent operation view.". However, **Kake** discloses:

- "...to render translucent an operation view for entering the operation input and display the translucent operation view.", (E.g., see Figure 3b

Art Unit: 2192

& Column 3, line 66- Column 4, line 5), wherein two objects are overlapped making them translucent for entering data input.

**Weinberg, Renner, Adams and Gough** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, a program, which gathers information and displays them in a window viewing environment. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine a translucent display with **Weinbergs** testing method and display. The motivation is disclosed by **Weinberg**, "The expert mode allows the user to... make modifications to the text. The user can thereby create functions and queries that may not be part of the automated features of the test to provide a higher level of test customization.", (Column 20, lines 7-11).

6. Claims **1-3, 7, 9-12 and 15-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Muraishi et al., US 2001/0028359 A1 (hereinafter **Muraishi**) in view of **Renner**.

In regard to claims **1, 9 and 11**, **Muraishi** discloses:

- "...computer readable medium storing...", (E.g., see Figure 12), wherein a computer readable medium is stored.
- "... for assisting in testing operation of a server computer which provides services using a structured document which can be browsed by a document browsing device, the test assisting program enabling a computer to carry out a process comprising steps of...", (E.g., see Figure 1 & Page 3, Paragraph [0053]), wherein the structured

document is the screen program and the document browsing device is the GUI.

- *"... acquiring formal requirements for data to be inputted to a data input area of the structured document upon reception of the structured document from the server computer ...", (E.g., see Figure 4 & Page 3, Paragraph [0060] and [0086]), wherein a server environment is disclosed comprising required information.*
- *"... generating candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area based on the formal requirements therefor ...", (E.g., see Figure 4 & Page 3, Paragraph [0062]), wherein the input data file is the candidate data and is based on the screen definition information or attribute information.*
- *"... inserting the candidate data for enabling the document browsing device to carry out a process of displaying the candidate data and a process of entering the candidate data selected by an operation input into the data input area, in the structured document...", (E.g., see Figure 3 & Page 3, Paragraph [0064] and [0066]).*
- *"... transferring the structured document with the candidate data inserted therein to the document browsing device .", (E.g., see Page 5, Paragraph [0086]), wherein it is inherent that in a server environment data is transferred.*

But **Murashi** does not expressly disclose "... *the formal requirements being defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof, the input area being defined in the structured document by using a second tag and parameters thereof, the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...*" or "... *into the structured document by using a third tag...*". However, **Renner** discloses:

- "... *the formal requirements being defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof...*", (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 21, lines 35-46), wherein the data (name) to be entered would comprise attribute value of the component used and that data provided (name) relates to the second tag describing the individual component .  
The first tag is the template used to hold the input name required (E.g., see Table 1B, line 9) and the second tag defines the input area (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, lines 21-24)
- "... *the input area being defined in the structured document by using a second tag and parameters thereof, the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...*", (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 21, lines 35-46), wherein the data (name) to be entered would comprise attribute value of the component used and that data provided (name) relates to the second tag describing the individual component . The first tag is the template used to hold the input name required (E.g., see Column 27, Table 1B, line 9) and the second tag defines the input area (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, lines 21-24).

- “...the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...”, (E.g., see Column 27, Table 1B, lines 1-13), wherein a default common value is given until a developer optionally adjusts the value at a later time.
- “... into the structured document by using a third tag...”, (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, line 5), wherein a third tag in the structured document involves a processing description.

**Murashi** and **Renner** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, managing a web server. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine first, second and third tags in a structured document with **Weinbergs'** testing method and display. The motivation is disclosed by **Renner** as the “custom” tags disclosed by Renner above (E.g., see Table 2) would have motivated a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify by creating custom tags as shown.

But **Murashi** and **Renner** do not expressly disclose “...maximum length of text...” or “... wherein the candidate data is a piece of text with a length greater than the maximum length acquired from the first tag, and wherein the piece of text describes in itself the fact that the length of the text is greater than the maximum length...” or “whereby a test operator operating the document browsing device can select and enter the candidate data to the data input area on the structured document with an intent to see how the server computer reacts to violation of the formal requirement for the data input area”. However, **Adams** discloses:

- “...maximum length of text...” (E.g., see Figure 4 & paragraph [0048]), wherein the minimum/maximum length of text is disclosed.
- “whereby a test operator operating the document browsing device can select and enter the candidate data to the data input area on the structured document with an intent to see how the server computer reacts to violation of the formal requirement for the data input area” (E.g., see Figure 6 & paragraph [0063]), wherein the invention allows for the generation of data that can purposely fail, and through this failure, invoke additional error handling programming.

However, the combined art of **Murashi, Renner and Adams** does not expressly disclose “... wherein the candidate data is a piece of text with a length greater than the maximum length acquired from the first tag, and wherein the piece of text describes in itself the fact that the length of the text is greater than the maximum length...”. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to test the boundaries of the minimum/maximum length of the data input in light of Adams disclosure of user editing the structural characteristics including maximum length of the data (See Figure 4 & paragraph [0047] – [0055]) for the benefits of purposely failing to invoke error handling as explicitly disclosed by the invention. Furthermore, **Adams** expressly discloses boundary testing for maximum values (See Figure 2 & paragraph [0071]), referred to as *maximum plus*, wherein *maximum plus* uses the *structural characteristics* to determine the maximum value in order to output one data set for each filed (24) that meets the maximum plus value, as well as one data

set for each field that exceed that maximum plus value with the presumption of success of failure indicated (*italics for emphasis added*).

With respect to "*describing in itself the fact that the length of the text is greater than the maximum length*" **Adams** discloses "structured data refers to XML, EDI or other "tagged" data formats" (See paragraph [0028]). Adams also expressly discloses that "the analysis of electronic data files requires descriptive information, whether found within the data file or sourced externally, to identify and describe each data element." (see paragraph [0003] – [0004]) wherein data benefits from descriptive information describing length. Additionally, **Adams** discloses a detailed table to list the structural characteristics that may be reviewed and/or edited by the user, including but not limited to minimum/maximum length (See paragraph [0047] – [0048]). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art, would have been motivated to describe the "maximum plus" data in the structured document used to purposely fail/test the system (computer/server computer) as disclosed by **Adams**.

In regard to claim 2, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Muraishi** discloses:

- "... generating data matching the formal requirements and data not matching the formal requirements.", (E.g., see Figure 9 & Page 4, Paragraph [0078]), wherein both cases are disclosed.

In regard to claim 15, **Muraishi** discloses:

- "A method for testing operation of a server computer from a browsing computer, comprising: acquiring information of a data input area upon

*reception of a document from the server computer ...”, (E.g., see Figure 4 & Page 3, Paragraph [0060] and [0086]), wherein a server environment is disclosed.*

*“... generating candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area based on the acquired information.”, (E.g., see Figure 4 & Page 3, Paragraph [0062]), wherein the input data file is the candidate data and is based on the screen definition information or attribute information.*

See claim 1 for the remaining limitations.

In regard to claims 3, 10 and 12 Muraishi discloses:

- *“... determining details of an operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out a process when the operation input is applied to the document browsing device...”, (E.g., see Figure 10 & Page 4, Paragraph [0080]), wherein input information or details are embedded in a input area of a screen program or browsing device.*
- *“... the determined details of the operation input are recorded...”, (E.g., see Figure 5 & Page 3, Paragraph [0066]), wherein the test results are recorded.*
- *“..., reproducing the operation input applied to the document browsing device according to the details of the operation input which are recorded.”, (E.g., see Figure 5 & Page 3, Paragraph [0066]), wherein the execution result of the previous test results are used and recorded.*

But **Muraishi** does not expressly disclose a "...log file." However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to save the execution data in a log file. The motivation to do so would have been to use the results for another test as disclosed by **Muraishi** (Page 3, Paragraph [0066]). Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to save the data in a log file.

In regard to claim 7, the rejections of base claim 3 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Muraishi** discloses:

- "...to measure a time from a decision in the operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out the process until a process result is returned from the server computer, and display the measured time....", (E.g., see Figures 30 & Page 7, Paragraph [0120])), wherein the output of the time measurement is disclosed.

In regard to claim 16, **Muraishi** does not expressly disclose "...wherein the inserting operation inserts third tag and parameters thereof after the second tag defining the data input area, such that the candidate data will be associated with the data input area." However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to insert the *third tag and parameters thereof* after the second tag defining the data input area, such that the candidate data will be associated with the data input area. It is old and well known in the art to further define information in a structured document with subsequent tags. Further motivation would have been that it

Art Unit: 2192

is old and well known in the art that structured documents are a hierarchical data structure that has a sequence of tags defining data.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Romano whose telephone number is (571) 272-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JJR



TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER